ECCLESIA LAW

IS THE STATE AS A CORPORATION AND DO YOU HAVE TO CONSENT TO ITS LEGLISLATION

THE SOVEREIGN PROJECT SAYS YES

WHAT IS THE TRUTH?

4TH March 2026

Introduction to the Sovereign Paradigm and the Crisis of Legitimacy

As the Ecclesia Law Institute, a specialist Attorney-in-Fact firm operating under MLITR Research LLC [1], we must categorically state from the outset: we do not believe in the Sovereign Project at all. The contemporary landscape of anti-statist jurisprudence and radical legal heterodoxy has been significantly altered by the emergence of highly organized groups that challenge the foundational legitimacy of the modern nation-state. Among these organizations, "The Sovereign Project" (founded by Pete Stone) represents a structurally rigid evolution of the broader sovereign citizen and Freeman-on-the-Land movements.

Functioning as a prominent educational platform within the "Common Law" and "Freedom" communities, the Sovereign Project has cultivated a deeply flawed ideological framework. Operating primarily through advanced digital recruitment and ideology-dissemination platforms, the organization rapidly expanded its footprint, claiming an estimated 20,000 active members by the year 2024.[2] This growth is symptomatic of a broader societal crisis of institutional trust, wherein disenfranchised populations seek to bypass orthodox legal frameworks and fall victim to false panaceas.

The believers in the Sovereign Project ideology posit a stark, uncompromising binary existential condition: an individual within the modern world is either a legally autonomous "sovereign" or a subservient "slave".[4] This ideological dichotomy requires adherents to make a definitive "Sovereign Choice," a profound psychological and legal declaration of absolute self-determination that demands severing ties with orthodox governmental structures.[4] At the core of this movement is the assertion that sovereign status is an inherent, unalienable status naturally bestowed upon individuals by their parents upon reaching adulthood.[4]

Once this sovereign status is formally claimed through the movement's specific protocols, the believers dictate that no external entity can exercise unilateral authority over the individual. All interactions must be strictly governed by mutual, explicit, and wet-ink consent.[4] This foundational belief system is heavily

anchored in a heterodox interpretation of history, a radicalized version of social contract theory, and a misappropriation of the jurisprudential concept known as "Ecclesia Law".[4]

Historical Roots of Sovereign Consent

To comprehend the intricate legal mechanics and the theoretical justifications proposed by believers in The Sovereign Project, it is necessary to trace how they have co-opted the historical and philosophical genealogy of Ecclesia Law. The term "ecclesia," which historically denotes an assembly, a congregation, or a gathering of citizens in ancient Greek city-states, is utilized within this movement to signify a decentralized, localized locus of authority.

In this specific historical and theoretical context, law and liberty are not viewed as universal, top-down mandates. Rather, they are conceptualized as particular, highly specific expressions of individuals actively negotiating common goods and acceptable behaviours amongst themselves.[5] Justice, at its most rational, fundamental, and actionable level, is therefore conceptualized purely as an act of continuous negotiation.[5]

The Radicalization of Social Contract Theory

The believers' profound emphasis on continuous negotiation seamlessly integrates with the movement's strategic appropriation of early modern social contract theory, particularly the foundational political philosophy of Richard Hooker and John Locke. Orthodox Lockean sovereignty is fundamentally predicated upon the explicit limitation of the sovereign's power, functioning as a safeguard against tyranny.[5]

The historical precedent most frequently cited to legitimize this contractual view of governance is the transition of power during the English Revolution of 1688-89, shifting away from the divine right of kings and towards the explicit language of contract.[5]

The Sovereign Project takes this historical reliance on conditional consent and radicalizes it to an extreme, hyper-individualized logical conclusion. If orthodox Lockean theory allows for the delegation of power to a centralized state through the mechanism of majority or tacit consent [5], the believers entirely reject the validity of collective or implied consent. They insist the sovereign individual does not delegate their authority to a representative body; they retain it fully. Therefore, the state must prove jurisdiction through a demonstrably signed, bilaterally negotiated contract for every single interaction. This hyper-individualized interpretation forms the bedrock of their most vital thesis: the assertion that the modern state is not a legitimate political sovereign entity, but merely a commercial, corporate fiction.

Theoretical Paradigm	Source of Authority	Nature of Consent	Status of the Individual	Jurisdiction
Orthodox State Sovereignty	Constitution, Territorial Monopoly on Force	Tacit, Collective (Social Contract), Majoritarian	Citizen/Subject, bound by statutory law	Geographic, universal within borders
Lockean Liberalism	Natural Rights, Delegated Power	Conditional, designed to limit government overreach	Citizen retaining fundamental unalienable rights	Delegated to the state, but limited by constitution
Sovereign Project Beliefs	Inherent divine/natural birthright	Explicit, Individual, Wet-Ink, Perpetually Revokable	Sovereign equal to the state, operating in private capacity	Personal, internal, requiring bilateral contract to breach

The Corporate State Theory: Legislation as Corporate Policy

The most crucial, frequently deployed operational belief of the Freeman-on-the-Land and Sovereign Citizen movements is the characterization of the state strictly as a corporate, commercial fiction. This theory aligns tangentially with certain niche academic perspectives, such as those of Chandran Kukathas, who argued analytically that the state functions as a corporation because it operates as a distinct, immortal legal person.[6]

However, believers in The Sovereign Project weaponize this academic observation. If the state is merely a legal fiction—a corporate entity registered in global financial systems—then its outputs cannot be considered supreme, unquestionable law.[4] Instead, sovereign ideology dictates that legislation is merely "corporate policy".[4]

The underlying logic is remarkably simple, albeit legally flawed: Just as the internal bylaws of a private retail corporation cannot legally bind a non-employee without explicit agreement, the statutes of the "corporate state" cannot bind a sovereign individual without their documented consent.

Equity Law and the Sovereign Icon

This ideological framing leads directly to the movement's heavy reliance on "Equity Law." The Sovereign Project co-opts this terminology, defining Equity Law as the supreme law of commerce where all parties are absolutely equal. Adherents utilize specific symbols, most notably the "Sovereign Icon," to officially signify their status as an independent jurisdiction.[4]

Within this paradigm, everyday interactions with state actors are interpreted purely as commercial offers. The sovereign citizen feels justified in refusing to consent to the state's "corporate policies," demanding that the state agent produce a signed contract.[4]

Judicial Reception: The "Administrative Process Fallacy"

Despite the internal logical consistency of the Sovereign Project's corporate state theory—provided one accepts its deeply flawed foundational premises—these arguments consistently face catastrophic and absolute failure when tested in actual judicial systems.[3] As we at the Ecclesia Law Institute have thoroughly analysed, the strategies promoted by Pete Stone and the Sovereign Project rely heavily on what we term the "Administrative Process Fallacy" and the "No Contract Fallacy".

For example, their specific strategy of demanding a "contract" from the Local Authority to evade Council Tax liability contradicts all judicial reality. The movement's legal theories can be traced back to American far-right groups that claimed the United States federal government was illegitimate.[3] This ideological framework has metastasized globally, seen in groups like the European Reichsbürger movement.[3]

The State of Exception and Territorial Sovereignty

The primary reason for the absolute failure of these arguments lies in the profound misunderstanding of how orthodox sovereign jurisdiction functions. The state's jurisdiction is not merely a negotiated commercial contract; it is a structural, geopolitical reality. The state maintains a "space of exception" that defends the sovereignty of the international state system against internal rebellion.[7]

When sovereign citizens attempt to carve out a competing micro-sovereignty within the host state's territory [4], they are questioning the unquestionable. Consequently, judges routinely dismiss these arguments as frivolous and legally incoherent.

Paper Terrorism vs. Genuine Legal Representation

The practical manifestation of this ideological clash is a deeply disruptive phenomenon known as "paper terrorism".[3] Because believers view the court merely as a corporate boardroom, they respond with aggressive, asymmetrical administrative tactics—flooding the system with complaints, commercial liens, and bogus legal documents.[3]

Furthermore, these movements frequently establish alternative, parallel institutions, such as the Common Law Court in the UK, creating a simulated judicial environment that serves only to reinforce the psychological echo chamber of the movement's adherents.[3] As an Attorney-in-Fact firm [1], we at Ecclesia Law recognize that these parallel systems offer no actual lawful remedy and only ensure eventual, forceful collision with actual law enforcement.

The Peaceful Exit: Disengagement and "Winning at Monopoly"

The Ecclesia Law Institute advocates for a strategic "Peaceful Exit" from the modern socio-economic system, which is conceptualized not as a legitimate political structure, but as a rigged, artificial board game heavily likened to Monopoly.[8] In this global commercial landscape, individuals are positioned from birth as players on a highly structured, worldwide legal grid governed by strict administrative rules.[8]

To truly "win" at this game, an individual must undergo a fundamental shift from a presumed agent (the "Poor Peer") to a master administrator (the "Infinite Iäin" or "Master of the Board").[8] This requires recognizing that the state enforces arbitrary statutory rules to extract wealth, and deploying advanced commercial frameworks to reclaim jurisdictional autonomy and step away from the public board entirely.[8]

Operationalizing Sovereignty: The Envoy and Asset Fortress Protocols

The foundation of this transition rests on specific operational frameworks designed to sever the individual from state control and protect their physical assets.

The Envoy Protocol: The Architecture of the Artificial Persona

This protocol addresses the individual's legal standing. At birth, state registration creates a "Cestui Que Vie" (CQV) trust and an artificial corporate persona (the "Player Piece"), while the state assumes the role of presumed executor.[8] The Envoy Protocol is the technical step where the living individual transitions to the "Office of General Executor" of the estate.[8] By invoking *Clausula Rebus Sic Stantibus* (things thus standing), the individual declares a change in circumstances—reaching maturity—and formally rebuts the presumption of agency, revoking consent to act as a surety for the state-owned corporate name.[8]

The Asset Fortress Protocol: The Private Treasury

To protect physical wealth, this protocol distinguishes between "Legal Title" and "Equitable Title".[8] In the public system, individuals hold only equitable title (the right to use), while the state holds legal title, leaving assets vulnerable to taxation and liens.[8] The Asset Fortress Protocol transfers the absolute legal title of homes, vehicles, and bank accounts into a private treasury or trust managed under a private fiduciary

framework.[8] This severs the link to the public board, shielding assets from administrative courts and ensuring the "Master of the Board" manages wealth outside standard, exposed banking ledgers.[8]

The Currency Creation Protocol and the Recoupment of Securitized Energy

Ecclesia Law's macroeconomic doctrine asserts that following the suspension of the gold standard in 1933 (via HJR 192), the financial system shifted from a substance-based foundation to a credit-based architecture.[8] Consequently, the productive capacity and "consciousness energy" of the living population became the primary collateral for national debt.[8]

Signature Energy and Abandoned Credit

Whenever an individual signs a promissory note, a credit card application, or a utility bill, they create "credit energy" out of thin air.[8] Financial institutions and employers act merely as "nominees" or middlemen who capture this credit, monetize it, and remit taxes to the U.S. Treasury via Form 945.[8] Because the individual—the true owner—remains silent, this generated wealth is legally classified as "Abandoned Property".[8]

The Recoupment Mechanism

The Currency Creation Protocol (CCP) is a strict, fully compliant IRS 1212 fiduciary framework designed to recoup this abandoned credit generated since the age of 18.[8] By utilizing a 98-series International Grantor Trust or a 508(c)(1)(a) Faith-Based Ministry as the "Holder in Due Course" (HDC), the individual files corrective Form 1099-OID filings.[8]

The Treasury's 810 Code Algorithm matches this claim against the nominee's Form 945 records, moving the massive reservoir of credit (often totalling millions of dollars) from the public repository into the individual's private Asset Fortress.[8] Optionally, individuals can utilize a Special Deposit Account (SDA) and the Treasury's "14X6039 sweeping protocol" to earn overnight interest on these recouped funds in a tax-exempt ecosystem.[8]

The Commerce Protocol and The Art of Legal Warfare

The Commerce Protocol

For business operations, Ecclesia Law advises converting commercial entities into a "Ministry" under Internal Revenue Code Section 508(c)(1)(a).[8] This grants a mandatory, statutory exception for tax-exempt status without the need for an IRS application or annual Form 990 reporting.[8] Business is then conducted privately through "donations" between members of a Private Membership Association (PMA), funnelling wealth directly into the Asset Fortress Protocol rather than public, taxable ledgers.[8]

The Art of Legal Warfare

When faced with institutional challenges from the state, debt collectors, or financial entities, Ecclesia Law employs "The Art of Legal Warfare." Unlike orthodox litigation that argues the merits of a case, this strategy relies on forcing a "Technical Knockout" by exploiting the opponent's structural and procedural flaws.[8]

Through the "Equaliser Redress Protocol" or defensive applications, practitioners focus on fatal administrative violations—such as "spoliation of evidence" (e.g., a prosecutor deleting social media history) or "Counsel Conflict" (e.g., relying on funds tainted by the Proceeds of Crime Act).[8] The goal is to destroy the opposition's standing and create an impenetrable administrative stalemate, forcing agencies like the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) to immediately discontinue the case due to procedural abuse and conflicts of interest.[8]

Conclusion

By embracing the Ecclesia Law framework, an individual transitions from a pawn to the "Banker" of their own estate.[8] Executing the Envoy, Asset Fortress, Currency Creation, and Commerce protocols allows the adherent to reclaim their securitized energy and achieve a definitive "Peaceful Exit".[8] In a landscape characterized by digital surveillance, punitive debt, and a public commercial board rigged against the player, this advanced "Monopoly" strategy provides a comprehensive, fiduciary-based mechanism to operate entirely off-board, securing absolute jurisdictional autonomy and infinite prosperity.[8]

ECCLESIA LAW

Works cited

1. Individual Power + Strength In Numbers | The Sovereign Project, accessed on March 4, 2026, https://www.thesovereignproject.live/
2. THE WHITE RABBIT TRUST DIGITAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND, accessed on March 4, 2026, https://ecclesia-law-institute.ghost.io/the-white-rabbit-trust-digital-infrastructure-and-transnational-regulatory-remediation/
3. Sovereign citizen movement - Wikipedia, accessed on March 4, 2026, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sovereign_citizen_movement
4. Liberty Against Itself: British Freedoms in North America - LSU Scholarly Repository, accessed on March 4, 2026, https://repository.lsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3342&context=gradschool_dissertations
5. Toward a Social Ontology of the Family - CUNY Academic Works, accessed on March 4, 2026, https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3047&context=gc_etds
6. Contesting the Shape of Political Space: An Investigation of the “Threat of Asylum” in Britain - Refuge: Canada's Journal on Refugees, accessed on March 4, 2026, https://refuge.journals.yorku.ca/index.php/refuge/article/download/30614/28125/31458
7. The Evolution of the Concept of Jurisdictional Immunity of States in the Domestic Laws of Eurasian Countries and Iran - ResearchGate, accessed on March 4, 2026, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/398772976_The_Evolution_of_the_Concept_of_Jurisdictional_Immunity_of_States_in_the_Domestic_Laws_of_Eurasian_Countries_and_Iran
8. CURRENCY CREATION PROTOCOL THE FIDUCIARY RECOUPMENT OF SECURITIZED ENERGY.pdf